UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/717,206	11/18/2003	David Trastour	B-5307 621517-4	6031

22879   7590   05/02/2008
HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER
KEEFER, MICHAEL E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2154	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
05/02/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

JERRY.SHORMA@HP.COM
mkraft@hp.com
ipa.mail@hp.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/717,206	TRASTOUR ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	MICHAEL E. KEEFER	2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _24 July 2007_.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) _1-21_ is/are pending in the application.
   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) _1-21_ is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on _18 November 2003_ is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a) ☒ All   b) ☐ Some *   c) ☐ None of:
       1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
       2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
       3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This Office Action is responsive to the Response to Electrion/Restriction

Requirement filed 7/24/2007. Claims 1-21 are pending, and claims 22-43 are withdrawn

from consideration.

Priority

2.   Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which

papers have been placed of record in the file.

Election/Restrictions

3.   Applicant's election with traverse of the restriction in the reply filed on 7/24/2007

is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that the Examiner has not properly

made the first test for restriction. This is not found persuasive because the groups are

distinct and non-obvious in view of each other.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

4.   Claims 22-43 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR

1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected group, there being no allowable generic or

linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in the reply

filed on 7/24/2008.

Specification

5.   The disclosure is objected to because it contains an embedded hyperlink and/or

other form of browser-executable code. Applicant is required to delete the embedded

hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. See MPEP § 608.01. (see at

least page 1 http://www.rosettanet.org, also page 3,

http://rosettanet.org/nextgenarchitecture and http://www.contivo.org)

Claim Objections

6.   Claims 8 and 9 are objected to because of the following informalities: the word

constraints at the end of the claim is misspelled. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

7.   35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is

directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 20 and 21 appear to be directed solely

to software per se, which is not a process, machine, manufacture or composition of

matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

9.   Claims 1 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Trastour (Semantic Web Support for the Business-to-Business E-Commerce Lifecycle)

in view of Dan et al. (US 2002/0178103), hereafter Dan.

Regarding **claims 1 and 20**, Trastour discloses:

A method of defining a common interactions protocol between two entities, the method comprising: inputting a description of each entity's messaging guidelines, the description including the entity's constraints on interacting with the other entity; (Page 14, Agreement formation states that various proposals are being made for an interaction (proposals are constraints on a prospective agreement))

calculating the union of the two descriptions; determining whether the union is satisfiable using a constraint resolver; (page 14, note that the union of all potential agreements (i.e. the constraints) is used to determine what agreements are compatible (i.e. satisfiable)

Trastour discloses all the limitations of claim 1 except for:

providing the intersection of the two descriptions as the common interactions protocol if the union is satisfiable; and

indicating where any incompatibility lies if the union is not satisfiable.

Dan teaches:

providing the intersection of the two descriptions as the common interactions protocol if the union is satisfiable; and ([0038] discloses combining like characteristics of two sets of constraints)

indicating where any incompatibility lies if the union is not satisfiable. ([0044-45] discloses evaluating the subsets of the union of constraints, and aborting when a union is not satisfiable, therefore informing the entities that the incompatibility lies with that subset.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Trastour and Dan in order to allow entities to automatically negotiate subsets of constraints.

Regarding **claim 6**, Trastour discloses:

6. A method according to Claim 1, wherein the messaging guidelines are input as instances of objects in an object-oriented description language. (Trastour discloses that DAML+OIL is an object-oriented description language)

Regarding **claim 8**, Dan teaches:

8. A method according to Claim 1, wherein the providing step comprises providing a specific subset of the common interactions protocol as a set of syntactic constraints. ([0032] discloses syntactic constraints (i.e. the document-exchange protocol))

Regarding **claim 9**, Dan teaches:

9. A method according to Claim 1, wherein the providing step comprises providing a specific subset of the common interactions protocol as a set of semantic constraints. ([0034] discloses that roles are included, which are semantic constraints)

Regarding **claim 11**, Dan teaches:

11. A method according to Claim 1, further comprising adjusting at least one entity's constraints if an incompatibility has been identified and then repeating the inputting, converting, calculating determining and adjusting steps until the union is satisfiable. ([0045] discloses counter-offers)

Regarding **claim 12**, Trastour discloses:

> 12. A method according to Claim 1, wherein the constraint resolver comprises a description logic reasoner. (Page 14, A standard logics reasoner is disclosed in paragraph 4)

10.   Claims 2-3, 7, 13-19, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Trastour and Dan as applied to claims 1 and 20 above, and further in view of Hellman et al. (US 2006/0167946), hereafter Hellman.

Trastour and Dan teach all the limitations of claims 2 and 21 except for converting the constraints into a semantic web ontology structure with a set of class hierarchies, properties and constraints.

Hellman teaches the conversion of XML schema into RDF schema. (See Col 13, lines 32-44)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Trastour and Dan with Hellman in order to make the system compatible with more platforms.

Regarding **claim 3**, Hellmen teaches:

> wherein the messaging guidelines are input as XML Schemas. (See Col 13, lines 32-44)

Regarding **claim 7**, Hellman teaches:

> further comprising inputting additional context specific constraints from the entity into the structure. (See Col 13, lines 32-44)

wherein the semantic web ontology structure is expressed as a Resource

Description Framework structure. (See Col 13, lines 32-44)

Regarding **claim 13**, Trastour teaches:

wherein the inputting step comprises:

specifying document constraints in a general way such that they are

applicable to a plurality of specific instances/classes of objects/processes;

(Pages 9-13 disclose specifying constraints in a general way)

and linking each constraint to a particular deployment context in which that

constraint is to be applied; such that when a run-time solution of the interaction

protocol is deployed, it can be decided depending on the deployment context

whether or not each constraint applies to any document. (Pages 9-13 disclose

linking constraints to specific objects or classes)

Regarding **claim 14**, Dan teaches:

wherein the messaging constraints are syntactic. ([0032] discloses

syntactic constraints (i.e. the document-exchange protocol))

Regarding **claim 15**, Dan teaches

wherein the messaging constraints are semantic. ([0034] discloses that

roles are included, which are semantic constraints)

Regarding **claim 16**, Trastour teaches:

wherein the deployment context comprises one or more elements from the

set comprising the document, the sender, the receiver, the backend system, the

business process and the department. (page 10 teaches the context being the

business process)

Regarding **claim 17**, Trastour teaches:

> wherein the deployment contexts are expressed using Boolean logic

between the elements. (page 10 teaches the using Boolean Logic)

Regarding **claim 18**, Trastour teaches:

> wherein the specifying step comprises specifying constraints applicable to

whole classes of objects/processes. (page 10 teaches having constraints apply

to all kinds of sales and other objects)

Regarding **claim 19**, Trastour teaches

> further comprising inheriting constraints in accordance with class/object

relationships. (page 10 discloses having classes that are composed of other

classes, i.e. inheritance)

11.   Claims 4-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Trastour, Dan, and Hellman as applied to claims 1-3 above, and further in view of

Boulmakoul, et al. "Nile: Automating B2B Connections Between Trading Partners",

hereafter Boulmakoul.

> Trastour, Dan, and Hellman teach all the limitations of claims 3-4 except

for using RosettaNet to define constraints and processes.

> The general concept of providing PIP information, and RosettaNet

schemas as constraints is well known in the art as taught by Boulmakoul. (see at

least page 12)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Trastour, Dan, and Hellman with the general concept of providing RosettaNet information as constraints as taught by Boulmakoul in order to make the system more robust and supportive of further common B2B protocols.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MICHAEL E. KEEFER whose telephone number is (571)270-1591. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 9am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan Flynn can be reached on (571) 272-1915. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MEK 4/24/2008

/Nathan J. Flynn/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2154